UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/942,639	08/31/2001	Rafael Joory	11788-002001	8815

26171   7590   03/17/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER
RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/942,639	JOORY, RAFAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Laurie Ries	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-78* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-78* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/23/03*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-20, 22-25, 34-43, 45, 47-59, 61-64, and 73-78 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent 5,838,918) in

view of Jarriel (U.S. Patent 5,996,012).

As per claims 1 and 40, Prager discloses a method for making application setup

data accessible to one or more destination applications including retrieving, from an

accessible data store, system setup data (See Prager, Column 16, lines 13-22) where a

"system" includes an application (See Prager, Column 2, lines 26-32), converting the

application setup data into a different data format (See Prager, Column 16, lines 54-57),

and enabling access to the system or application setup data of converted data format by

one or more destination software applications on one or more destination computers

(See Prager, Column 16, lines 44-47). Prager does not disclose expressly that the

application setup data is in a first data format. Jarriel discloses application setup data

having an initial format configuration (See Jarriel, Column 6, lines 24-47). Prager and

Jarriel are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

processing data in a distributed computing environment. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the initial data

format of Jarriel with the method of converting application setup data of Prager. The

motivation for doing so would have been to enable the application developer to validate

the application prototyping data used to generate the finished application (See Jarriel,

Column 6, lines 39-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jarriel with

Prager for the benefit of enabling the application developer to validate the application

prototyping data used to generate the finished application to obtain the invention as

specified in claims 1 and 40.

As per claims 2 and 42, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and

40 as described above. Prager also discloses retrieving less than all application setup

data (See Prager, Column 4, lines 16-22 and Column 17, lines 31-33).

As per claims 3 and 42, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 2 and

41 as described above. Prager also discloses that the application setup data is

retrieved from the accessible data store intelligently (See Prager, Column 16, lines 58-

59).

As per claims 4 and 43, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 2 and

41 as described above. Prager also discloses retrieving user-customized application

setup data (See Prager, Column 3, lines 43-44).

As per claims 6 and 45, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and

40 as described above. Prager also discloses that the application setup data includes

application end-purpose data (See Prager, Column 8, lines 60-65).

As per claims 8 and 47, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses the application setup data that does not include mail address information, favorites information, calendar information, task information, email information, journal notes or cookies (See Prager, Column 16, lines 33-43).

As per claims 9 and 48, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses removing at least one application-specific code from the application setup data (See Prager, Column 10, lines 24-41).

As per claims 10 and 49, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 48 as described above. Prager also discloses changing the application setup data into a format that is incompatible with a source software application from which the application settings data was derived (See Prager, Column 11, lines 44-64).

As per claims 11 and 50, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 10 and 49 as described above. Prager also discloses converting at least some of the application setup data into a format that is incompatible with at least one of the source and destination software applications (See Prager, Column 11, lines 44-64).

As per claims 12 and 51, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 11 and 50 as described above. Prager also discloses converting at least some of the application setup data into a format that is incompatible with both of the source and destination software applications (See Prager, Column 11, lines 44-64).

As per claims 13 and 52, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 9 and 48 as described above. Prager also discloses changing the application setup data

from the first data format that is incompatible with the destination software application to

the second data format that is compatible with the destination software application (See

Prager, Column 11, lines 56-64).

As per claims 14 and 53, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses determining a category for the

application setup data among several predetermined categories of application setup

data (See Prager, Column 6, lines 50-56) and where enabling access includes enabling

access by the destination software applications to the categories of application setup

data (See Prager, Column 7, lines 22-31).

As per claims 15 and 54, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 14

and 53 as described above. Prager also discloses storing the application setup data in

a manner that enables access to the application setup data based on the category

determined and where enabling access to the application setup data includes enabling

access to the stored application setup data that have a category consistent with the

category of information accessed by the destination software applications (See Prager,

Column 6, lines 57-67 and Column 7, lines 1-5).

As per claims 16 and 55, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 15

and 54 as described above. Prager also discloses that enabling access also includes

identifying the destination software applications, determining the categories of

application setup data accessed b the destination software applications identified, and

making the application setup data available when the categories of application setup

data accessed by the destination software applications include the category determined

for the application setup data (See Prager, Column 17, Claim 1).

As per claims 17 and 56, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses accessing a source computer, in the

form of a manager machine, at which a user selected the application setup data (See

Prager, Column 17, lines 5-6) and enabling access to the application setup data

includes storing the application setup data, after conversion, in a data store, or central

configuration database, that is remote to the source and destination computers (See

Prager, Column 17, lines 9-11).

As per claims 18 and 57, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses accessing the application setup data

on a data store that is remote to one or more source computers through which the

application setup data was selected (See Prager, Column 17, lines 11-25).

As per claims 19 and 58, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 18

and 57 as described above. Prager also discloses enabling access to the application

setup data at the data store that is remote to the one or more source computers (See

Prager, Column 6, lines 57-67 and Column 7, lines 1-5).

As per claims 20 and 59, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 18

and 57 as described above. Prager also discloses storing the application setup data on

the destination computer (See Prager, Column 17, lines 34-37).

As per claims 22 and 61, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses accessing the application setup data

from a local area network server that serves a first computer operated by a user (See

Prager, Figure 12, element 1200), and enabling access includes enabling access by a

second computer operated by the user that is not served by the server (See Prager,

Figure 12, and Column 14, lines 4-9).

As per claims 23 and 62, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses selectively retrieving additional data

other than application setup data from the accessible data store with the application

setup data, the additional data also having the first data format (See Prager, Column 16,

lines 34-36), converting the application setup data from the first data format into a

second data format (See Prager, Column 16, lines 54-57), and enabling the one or

more destination software applications on one or more destination computers access to

the additional data of the second data format (See Prager, Column 16, lines 4-47).

As per claims 24 and 63, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses accessing the accessible data store

at a source computer where the application setup data was selected and enabling

access to the application setup data of second data format by the one or more

destination computers includes storing the application setup data of second data format

on an intermediate data store that is accessible to the one or more destination

computers (See Prager, Figure 4, element 400, and Column 6, lines 20-39).

As per claims 25 and 64, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses that the accessible data store is

remote from a source computer where the application setup data was selected (See Prager, Column 11, lines 7-13).

As per claims 34 and 73, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses that application setup and selective other data are retrieved, converted and made available for access (See Prager, Column 10, lines 24-32).

As per claims 35 and 74, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses rendering inaccessible at least some of the application setup data that is accessed by the destination software applications before access is enabled (See Prager, Column 10, lines 64-67).

As per claims 36 and 75, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager also discloses preserving at least some of the application setup data that is accessed by the destination software applications before access is enabled (See Prager, Column 11, lines 2-6).

As per claims 37 and 76, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 75 as described above. Prager also discloses reinstating at least some of the application setup data that has been preserved when access is disabled (See Prager, Column 10, lines 16-23).

As per claims 38-39 and 77-78, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 75 as described above. Jarriel also discloses updating the application setup data stored at the accessible data store by synchronizing the application setup data accessed by the destination application with corresponding application setup data

stored at the accessible data store and where changes to the application setup data

resulting from simultaneous application of the application setup data to more than one

destination application are resolved through the synchronizing (See Jarriel, Column 1,

lines 20-38). Prager and Jarriel are analogous art because they are from the same field

of endeavor of processing data in a distributed computing environment. At the time of

the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include

the synchronization of application setup data of Jarriel with the method of Prager and

Jarriel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a system administrator

the ability to detect and resolve conflicts between endpoint configurations (See Jarriel,

Column 1, lines 25-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jarriel with

Prager and Jarriel for the benefit of allowing a system administrator the ability to detect

and resolve conflicts between endpoint configurations to obtain the invention as

specified in claims 38-39 and 77-78.

Claims 5, 7, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent 5,838,918) in view of Jarriel (U.S. Patent

5,996,012) as applied to claims 1 and 40 above, and further in view of Okawa (U.S.

Patent 6,317,762 B1).

As per claims 5 and 44, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and

40 as described above. Prager and Jarriel do not disclose expressly that the application

setup data includes data of constant size. Okawa discloses a block of data of a

constant size (See Okawa, Column 3, lines 37-41). Prager, Jarriel and Okawa are

analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of converting electronic

data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to include the data of a constant size of Okawa with the method of

application setup data conversion of Prager and Jarriel. The motivation for convert

input data to a normalized size (See Okawa, Column 2, lines 65-66). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Okawa with Prager and Jarriel for the benefit of

converting input data to a normalized size to obtain the invention as specified in claims

5 and 44.

As per claims 7 and 46, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1 and

40 as described above. Prager and Jarriel do not disclose expressly that the application

setup data includes display formatting data for one or more software programs. Okawa

discloses display formatting data for software programs (See Okawa, Column 9, lines

43-50). Prager, Jarriel and Okawa are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of converting electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the display formatting data

of Okawa with the method of application setup data conversion of Prager and Jarriel.

The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the resizing of regions of the

display (See Okawa, Column 10, lines 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Okawa with Prager and Jarriel for the benefit of enabling the resizing of

regions of the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 46.

Claims 21, 29-32, 60, and 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent 5,838,918) in view of Jarriel (U.S. Patent

5,996,012) as applied to claims 1 and 40 above, and further in view of Dardinski (U.S.

Patent 6,754,885 B1).

As per claims 21 and 60, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of claims 1

and 40 as described above. Prager and Jarriel do not disclose expressly providing

shortcut icons on the destination computer that correspond to one or more different

application setup data for which access is enabled. Dardinski discloses providing

shortcut icons (See Dardinski, Column 127, lines 10-19). Prager, Jarriel and Dardinski

are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating

configuration data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to include the shortcut icons of Dardinski with the method of

Prager and Jarriel. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a set of

menu selections to the user that is associated with the main application (See Dardinski,

Column 127, lines 3-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dardinski

with Prager and Jarriel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 21 and 60.

As per claims 29-32 and 68-71, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of

claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager and Jarriel do not disclose expressly that

the source and destination software applications are similar, are different instantiations

of a single application, are different versions of a single software application, and that

the source and destination software applications perform a similar function. Dardinski

discloses that the data can be a different state, or version, of an object, each version

being represented by a distinct instance of the same object, which, as is obvious, would

perform the same or similar functions (See Dardinski, Column 53, lines 40-52). Prager,

Jarriel and Dardinski are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of manipulating configuration data. At the time of the invention it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data of a different

state or version of Dardinski with the method of Prager and Jarriel. The motivation for

doing so would have been to allow an object's identity to remain constant throughout

the lifetime of an object, thereby allowing referential integrity to be maintained (See

Dardkinski, Column 53, lines 43-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Dardinski with Prager and Jarriel for the benefit of allowing an object's identity to remain

constant throughout the lifetime of an object to obtain the invention as specified in

claims 29-32 and 68-71.

Claims 26-28 and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Prager (U.S. Patent 5,838,918) in view of Jarriel (U.S. Patent

5,996,012) as applied to claims 1 and 40 above, and further in view of Kahan (U.S.

Publication 2002/0024536 A1).

As per claims 26-28 and 65-67, Prager and Jarriel disclose the limitations of

claims 1 and 40 as described above. Prager and Jarriel do not disclose expressly that

the destination computer is a portable device that has limited storage capacity, such as

a cellular telephone or a handheld device. Kahan discloses a portable device including

a cellular telephone or handheld device (See Kahan, Page 5, paragraph 0065). Prager,

Jarriel and Kahan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor

of manipulating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the portable devices of Kahan with the

method of converting application setup data of Prager and Jarriel. The motivation for

doing so would have been to allow the reordering of data items displayed on a mobile

terminal based upon the characteristics of the data item, and to allow for the deletion of

data items based upon a profile assigned to each data item (See Kahan, Page 1,

paragraph 0007). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kahan with Prager

and Jarriel for the benefit of allowing the reordering of data items displayed on a mobile

terminal based upon the characteristics of the data item and allowing for the deletion of

data items based upon a profile assigned to each data item to obtain the invention as

specified in claims 26-28 and 65-67.

Claims 33 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Prager (U.S. Patent 5,838,918) in view of Jarriel (U.S. Patent 5,996,012) and

Dardinski (U.S. Patent 6,754,885 B1) as applied to claims 32 and 71 above, and further

in view of Kahan (U.S. Publication 2002/0024536 A1).

As per claims 33 and 72, Prager, Jarriel and Dardinski disclose the limitations of

claims 32 and 71 as described above. Prager, Jarriel and Dardinski do not disclose

expressly that the source and destination software applications are electronic mail

applications. Kahan discloses including data items for email servers, which would

inherently be delivered via electronic mail (See Kahan, Page 5, paragraph 0058).

Prager, Jarriel, Dardinski and Kahan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the electronic mail applications of Kahan with the method of converting application setup data of Prager, Jarriel and Dardinski. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the formatting of application data based on a user profile (See Kahan, Page 1, paragraphs 0007-0008). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kahan with Prager, Jarriel and Dardinski for the benefit of providing for the formatting of application data based on a user profile to obtain the invention as specified in claims 33 and 72.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Guck (U.S. Patent 5,911,776) discloses an automatic format conversion system and publishing methodology for a multi-user network.

- Rose (U.S. Patent 6,073,148) discloses displaying electronic documents with substitute fonts.

- Sheard (U.S. Patent 6,208,345 B1) discloses a visual data integration system and method.

- Hartley (U.S. Patent 6,532,465 B2) discloses an operational system for operating on client-defined rules.

- Helgeson (U.S. Patent 6,643,652 B2) discloses a method and apparatus for managing data exchange among systems in a network.

- El Rayess discloses the automatic generation of performance models using the distributed management framework (DMF).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached at (571) 272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER